

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. The Office Action dated September 8, 2004 has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. The specification and the drawings have been amended in this Response. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended and Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-16, and 21-22 have been withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

The drawings stand objected to for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they do not contain four reference numerals that were mentioned in the specification. Insofar as they may be applied against the amended drawings and the amended specification, these objections are deemed overcome.

The drawings and the specification have been amended accordingly to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). The reference numerals 121 and 122 have been added in Figure 1. In the specification the reference numerals 300 and 400 have been replaced with the reference numerals 218 and 226, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

The specification stands objected to for some informalities. Insofar as they may be applied against the amended specification and the amended drawings, these objections are deemed overcome.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection of the specification based upon the language "and the like." This language is not prohibited by M.P.E.P. § 608.01 nor 37 C.F.R. § 1.71, and therefore is not required to be omitted. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The reference numerals 121 and 122 now appear in FIG.1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with applicant regards as the invention. Claim 9 has been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 9 is moot.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. No. 5,924,116 to Aggarwal et al. (Aggarwal). Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-16, and 21-22 have been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-16, and 21-22 are moot.

Rejected Claim 1 has been amended to describe one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, the language “indicating in the response the conditions under which the URL information should be invalidated” has been added to Claim 1. This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal’s patent involves using a cache hierarchy label (“CHL”) to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by “indicating in the response the conditions under which the URL information should be invalidated” the cache proxy of Claim 1 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is deemed overcome by these amendments.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that amended Claim 1 be allowed.

Claim 2 depends upon and further limits amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that amended Claim 1 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 2 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 2 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 5 describes one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, this feature is “indicating in the header whether the URL information... is to be invalidated by the one or more cache proxies.” This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal’s patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by “indicating in the header whether the URL information... is to be invalidated” the cache proxy of Claim 5 can handle

requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 5 is deemed overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in Claim 5. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 5 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that Claim 5 be allowed.

Claim 6 depends upon and further limits Claim 5. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that Claim 5 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 6 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 6 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 7 describes one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, this feature is receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated. This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal's patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated the cache

proxy of Claim 7 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 7 is deemed overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in Claim 7. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 7 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that Claim 7 be allowed.

Claim 8 depends upon and further limits Claim 7. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that Claim 7 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 8 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 8 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 11 describes one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, this feature is receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated and preventing the use of the cached URL information in response to a second request. This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal's patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by receiving a

response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated and preventing the use of the cached URL information in response to a second request, the cache proxy of Claim 11 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 11 is deemed overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in Claim 11. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 11 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that Claim 11 be allowed.

Claim 12 depends upon and further limits Claim 11. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that Claim 11 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 12 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 12 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 13 has been amended to describe one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, the language “means for indicating in the response the conditions under which the URL information should be invalidated” has been added to Claim 13. This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal’s patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal

teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by “indicating in the response the conditions under which the URL information should be invalidated” the cache proxy of Claim 13 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 13 is deemed overcome by these amendments.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in amended Claim 13. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 13 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that amended Claim 13 be allowed.

Claim 14 depends upon and further limits amended Claim 13. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that amended Claim 13 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 14 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 17 describes one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, this feature is a “means for indicating in the header whether the URL information... is to be invalidated by the one or more cache proxies.” This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal’s patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal

teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast by “indicating in the header whether the URL information... is to be invalidated” the cache proxy of Claim 17 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 17 is deemed overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in Claim 17. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 17 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that Claim 17 be allowed.

Claim 18 depends upon and further limits Claim 17. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that Claim 17 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 18 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 19 describes one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, this feature is receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated. This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal’s patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal

teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated the cache proxy of Claim 19 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 19 is deemed overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in Claim 19. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 19 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that Claim 19 be allowed.

Claim 20 depends upon and further limits Claim 19. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that Claim 19 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 20 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 20 be withdrawn.

Rejected Claim 23 describes one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. Specifically, this feature is receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated and preventing the use of the cached URL information in response to a second request. This feature enables the cache proxies to manage the URL information more efficiently. If the URL information is marked invalid, then the requested URL information is immediately retrieved from the content hosts.

Aggarwal does not suggest, teach or disclose this limitation. Aggarwal's patent involves using a CHL to indicate where URL information should be cached. This CHL does not have the

ability to indicate to the cache proxy that the URL information should be invalidated. Aggarwal teaches a process to determine if the URL information is obsolete by using a time stamp, but this process only works after the information has been requested again. In contrast, by receiving a response with a header that indicates whether the URL information is to be invalidated and preventing the use of the cached URL information in response to a second request, the cache proxy of Claim 23 can handle requests more efficiently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 23 is deemed overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the unique feature of the present invention that is now recited in Claim 23. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 23 is clearly distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and that Claim 23 be allowed.

Claim 24 depends upon and further limits Claim 23. Therefore, for at least some of the aforementioned reasons that Claim 23 is deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 24 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 24 be withdrawn.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 17-20, and 23-24.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and

to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: 12/8/04

CARR LLP

670 Founder's Square

900 Jackson Street

Dallas, Texas 75202

Telephone: (214) 760-3030

Fax: (214) 760-3003


Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 1 has been amended to include the reference numerals 121 and 122.